IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS MARSHALL DIVISION

SABATINO BIANCO, MD	§
Plaintiff,	§ Civil Action No. 2:12-CV-00147-WCB
V.	§ JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
GLOBUS MEDICAL, INC.	§
Defendant.	\$ \$
	§

GLOBUS MEDICAL, INC.'S MOTION TO RECONSIDER DENIAL OF ITS MOTION TO FIND THE CASE EXCEPTIONAL [DKT. 280] BASED ON OCTANE FITNESS

Globus Medical, Inc. ("Globus") requests this Court reconsider the denial of Globus' Motion to Find the Case Exceptional [Dkt. 280]:

- 1. On April 2, Globus filed its Motion to Find the Case Exceptional. On April 17, the Court denied Globus' motion.²
- 2. On April 29, the U.S. Supreme Court issued an opinion clarifying the test for determining whether a case is exceptional under the Patent Act and the level of evidence required to make such a determination. *See Octane Fitness, LLC v. ICON Health & Fitness, Inc.*, April 29, 2014 Slip Opinion.
- 3. In *Octane Fitness*, the Court rejected the *Brooks Furniture* framework as "overly rigid." *Id.*, at p. 8. The Court then held that an exceptional case is simply one that stands out from others with respect to substantive strength of a party's litigating position (considering both

¹ Dkt. 270.

² Dkt. 280.

the governing law and the facts of the case) or the unreasonable manner in which the case was litigated. *Id.*, at 7-8. Finally, the Court rejected the Federal Circuit's requirement that patent litigants prove entitlement to fees under § 285 by "clear and convincing evidence." *Id.*, at 11.

4. Because this Court evaluated Globus' motion under the *Brooks Furniture* framework, Globus respectfully requests the Court to reconsider Globus' motion in light of the *Octane Fitness* test.

PRAYER

Globus requests this Court reconsider the denial of Globus' Motion to Find the Case Exceptional [Dkt. 280] and evaluate the motion under the *Octane Fitness* test.

³ Dkt. 280, at 10 ("For the foregoing reasons, the Court concludes that Globus has failed to satisfy its burden of showing, by clear and convincing evidence, that the position taken by Dr. Bianco with regard to the inventorship claim was objectively baseless and brought in subjective bad faith.").

⁴ In the event Globus appeals this issue, the appellate court presumably would remand for this Court to reconsider its opinion in light of the *Octane Fitness* test. Reconsideration at this stage is therefore appropriate for the sake of judicial economy.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 9, 2014

/s/ R. Brandon Bundren Thomas W. Sankey State Bar No. 17635670 twsankey@duanemorris.com Gregory M. Luck State Bar No. 12666380 gmluck@duanemorris.com R. Brandon Bundren State Bar No. 24050353 rbbundren@duanemorris.com Diana M. Sangalli State Bar No. 24033926 dmsangalli@duanemorris.com Corey M. Weideman State Bar No. 24056505 cmweideman@duanemorris.com **DUANE MORRIS LLP** 1330 Post Oak Blvd., Suite 800 Houston, Texas 77056-3166 Telephone: (713) 402-3900 (713) 402-3901 Facsimile:

Matthew A Taylor (pro hac vice) mataylor@duanemorris.com
Lawrence H. Pockers (pro hac vice) lhpockers@duanemorris.com
Jeffrey S. Pollack
jspollack@duanemorris.com
DUANE MORRIS LLP
30 South 17th Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103-4196
Telephone: (215) 979-1000
Facsimile: (215) 979-1020

ATTORNEYS FOR GLOBUS MEDICAL, INC.

Case 2:12-cv-00147-WCB Document 288 Filed 05/09/14 Page 4 of 5 PageID #: 11061

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on May 9, 2014, I electronically filed the foregoing document with the Clerk of the Court for the U.S. District Court, Eastern District of Texas, Marshall Division, using the Court's CM/ECF system which will send notice of filing to all counsel of record who are deemed to have consented to electronic service per Local Rule CV-5(a)(3).

/s/ R. Brandon Bundren

R. Brandon Bundren

CERTIFICATE OF CONFERENCE

I certify that per Local Rule CV-7(i)(10), neither the meet and confer nor the certificate of conference requirements are applicable to motions for reconsideration.

/s/ R. Brandon Bundren
R. Brandon Bundren
Counsel for Globus Medical, Inc.